

### **REMARKS**

This communication is responsive to the Office Action dated April 9, 2009 and received in this application. In the amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 11, 16, 22 and 23 have been amended to introduce or incorporate features previously recited in dependent claims, have been amended to correct dependency, or have been rewritten in independent form. These amendments add no new matter. Claims 5 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-28 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 5, 6, 15 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the features of any intervening claims. Claim 15 previously depended from claim 7 and has been incorporated therein. Claim 5 did not directly depend from claim 1, but has been incorporated therein as the features of claim 5 are believed to have been indicated as allowable upon such incorporation, in light of the indication regarding claim 15. Independent claims 22 and 23 have also been amended to incorporate the same features. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7, 22 and 23, and the claims depending from those claims are believed to be in condition for allowance based upon the indications in the Action.

Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,332,661 to Yamaguchi ("Yamaguchi") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,313,780 to Hughes et al. ("Hughes"). This rejection is traversed.

Independent claims 1, 7, 22 and 23 are believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons noted above, and thus the rejection of these claims is believed to be moot.

Claim 3 recites: "[a] *current output type drive circuit for outputting a drive current to a driven object shared by being divided into a plurality of areas,*  
*comprising a plurality of drivers arranged corresponding to each the shared area of the driven object,*  
*each driver comprising*

*an output means for outputting a supplied reference current and the drive current corresponding to image data to a corresponding shared area of the driven object and a reference current source circuit for sampling and holding the reference current input from a reference current input terminal, then supplying the same to the output means, wherein said reference current source circuit comprises a current sampling circuit including a current memory for sampling and holding said reference current in accordance with a control signal and a control circuit for outputting to said current sampling circuit a control signal for controlling write and read operations of said reference current of the current memory of said current sampling circuit, and wherein said current sampling circuit includes a first current memory and a second current memory, and said control circuit outputs to said current sampling circuit said control signal so as to alternately perform a write operation of the reference current input from said reference current input terminal and a read operation of the written reference current on said first current memory and second current memory.”*

These claimed features are neither disclosed nor suggested by the relied-upon references. Yamaguchi discloses a constant current driving semiconductor integrated circuit configured to drive several loads by using a reference current generating circuit that is embedded to derive a reference output current generated on a reference resistance from a reference output terminal. This provides constant current driver ICs that are intended to operate in a state of small variations in output currents. Applicant submits that this arrangement is similar to that described in Applicant's background of the invention, and is clearly distinct from and not suggestive in any way of Applicant's claimed invention.

Additionally, and in particular regarding claim 3, Yamaguchi clearly fails to disclose “... *said current sampling circuit includes a first current memory and a second current memory, and said control circuit outputs to said current sampling circuit said control signal so as to alternately perform a write operation of the reference current input from said reference current input terminal*

*and a read operation of the written reference current on said first current memory and second current memory.”*

Hughes does not remedy the deficiencies of Yamaguchi in this regard. In Hughes, there are two current memories M41 and M42, but they are very clearly configured and operated in a different fashion. In Hughes, in fact, it is an express advantage that the analog signal is fed from stage to stage using only one current memory (M41), with the second current memory (M42) apparently used to produce a residual current output.

This is clearly distinct from alternately performing write and read operations with the first and second current memories as claimed by Applicant, and particularly in the context claimed by Applicant.

The combination of Yamaguchi and Hughes thus still fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 3, so a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented for the claim. For reasons similar to those provided regarding claim 3, and for additional recitations therein, claim 11 is also neither disclosed nor suggested.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Hughes.

This response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of the claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers. Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicant expressly does not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully requests the Examiner to provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

Dated: May 21, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

Christopher M. Tobin

Registration No.: 40,290

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorneys for Applicant